1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA** 7 8 9 STEVEN FLOYD VOSS, Petitioner, 10 Case No. 3:11-cv-00223-LRH-WGC 11 VS. **ORDER** GREG COX, et al. 12 Respondents. 13 14 15 Before the court in this closed action are petitioner's motion for relief from judgment (ECF No. 87) and motion to disqualify (ECF No. 88), and respondents' oppositions to both (ECF No. 89, 16 17 90). The motions are without merit. In an earlier motion (ECF No. 83), petitioner argued that the undersigned should recuse 18 19 himself because his son is now the District Attorney for Washoe County. The court rejected that argument because his son was elected and entered office long after the court closed this action. 20 21 Petitioner now argues that he should have relief from the judgment and that the undersigned 22 should be disqualified because his son was employed by the Washoe County District Attorney's Office at the time this action was open. That employment by itself, without any involvement in 23 petitioner's criminal case, is insufficient to disqualify the undersigned. 24 25 Reasonable jurists would not find the court's conclusion to be debatable or wrong, and the court will not issue a certificate of appealability. 26 27 /// 28 ///

1	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that petitioner's motion for relief from judgment (ECF No.
2	87) is <b>DENIED</b> .
3	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioners' motion to disqualify (ECF No. 88) is
4	DENIED.
5	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a certificate of appealability is <b>DENIED</b> .
6	DATED this 7th day of September, 2016.
7	7/1/2/
8	LARDY R. HICKS
9	UNĪTED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
10	
11	
12	
13	
4	
15	
16	
17 18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

28